



Project No. 2010-1-PT1-LEO05-05164

**Project funded by the European Commission:**



## Second Evaluation Report

<b>Document Title:</b>	<b>BEST FORM project "Second Evaluation Report"</b>
Author(s):	Sónia Hetzner, Anna Slyschak
E-mail address:	<a href="mailto:Sonia.hetzner@fim.uni-erlangen.de">Sonia.hetzner@fim.uni-erlangen.de</a> ; <a href="mailto:anna.slyschak@fim.uni-erlangen.de">anna.slyschak@fim.uni-erlangen.de</a>
Contributors to document:	All partners
Date of Delivery:	24.12.2012
Confidentiality Status:	Confidential

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND THE ROLE OF THE PARTNERS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	COMMENTS ON "ROLE OF THE CO-ORDINATOR IN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT" .....	5
1.2	COMMENTS ON "FEASIBILITY/PRACTICALITY OF PROJECT PLANNING" .....	6
1.3	COMMENTS ON "HANDLING OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS" .....	6
1.4	COMMENTS ON "PROBLEM-SOLVING" .....	7
1.5	COMMENTS ON "RELEVANCE BETWEEN STATED OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT" .....	8
1.6	COMMENTS ON "ACCORD AND SHARED VISIONS WITHIN THE WP" .....	9
1.7	COMMENTS ON "SATISFACTION WITH THE STATE OF DEVELOPMENT OF ACTIVITIES IN THE WPS" .....	10
<b>2</b>	<b>COMMUNICATION.....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	COMMENTS ON "THE ROLE OF THE CO-ORDINATOR IN THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS" ..	12
2.2	COMMENTS ON "COMMUNICATION FLOWS AMONG PARTNERS" .....	13
2.3	COMMENTS ON "LEVEL OF ATTENTION ON THE DEVELOPED WORK (E.G. FEEDBACK)" .....	13
2.4	COMMENTS ON "PARTNERS' ACTIVE ATTITUDE" (E.G. INITIATIVE IN PRESENTING PROPOSALS AND THEMES FOR ELABORATION/DISCUSSION).....	14
2.5	COMMENTS ON "TECHNICAL ISSUES USING THE PROJECT COMMUNICATION TOOLS" .....	15
<b>3</b>	<b>ADDED VALUE (OF INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1	COMMENTS ON "EXPECTED ADDED VALUE OF THE PLANNED PROJECT OUTCOMES FOR THE ADDRESSED BENEFICIARIES" .....	16
3.2	COMMENTS ON "ADDED VALUE OF THE PROJECT COMPARED TO SIMILAR INITIATIVES WHICH YOU KNOW OF / YOU PARTICIPATE IN" .....	18
3.3	COMMENTS ON "EXPECTED LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES" .....	18
<b>4</b>	<b>STRENGTHS OF BEST FORM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>22</b>

## Results of the second evaluation round with 7 participants:

XXI INVESLAN, S.L., ES

Association of Community Based Business Advice, UNITED KINGDOM

UCODEP, IT

Uniwersytet Łódzki, PL

Universitatea din Pitesti, RO

Associação de Solidariedade Internacional, PT

Institute for Innovation in Learning, University of Erlangen Nuremberg, DE

## 1 GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND THE ROLE OF THE PARTNERS

In the following a brief description of the development of the project can be found, which is based on an evaluation questionnaire filled in by all BEST FORM partners.

Dimension	Period 2: Participants stating a "high to very high level of satisfaction" in percentage(number of answers)	Missing answers	Period 1: Participants stating a "high to very high level of satisfaction" in percentage(number of answers)	Missing answers
Role of the co-ordinator in project development	100% (8)	1	100% (7)	1
Feasibility/practicality of project planning	87,5% (7)	1	100% (8)	-
Handling of administrative and financial matters	100% (8)	1	62,5% (5)	1
Problem-solving	87,5% (7)	1	100% (8)	-
Relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out	100% (9)	-	87,5% (7)	-
Accord and shared visions within the WP	88,87% (7)	-	87,5% (7)	-
Satisfaction with the state of development of activities in the WPs	55,56% (5)	-	87,5% (7)	-

*Table 1: Project development and partners role for period two and one.*

The partners are very content with the role of the co-ordinator regarding the project development as well as with the relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out and also with the handling of administrative and financial matters. 87.5% of the partners are also content with the feasibility and practicality of project planning, with the aspect of problem solving and 88,87% with the accord and shared visions within the WP.

More than the half of the partners (55,56%) is content with the state of development of activities in the WPs. But we have a drop if compared with period one of the project, in which the level of satisfaction was 87,5%. The handling of administrative matters, which was one issue of concern in round one was solved, the rating improved from 62,5% to 100% satisfaction.

Summing up the results indicate a positive development of the project although state of development of activities in the WPs can be and should be improved.

Below there are individual comments on each single question.

### **1.1 Comments on "Role of the co-ordinator in project development"**

#### **Problems encountered:**

- The information concerning the exchange rate was send without not enough time and this delay the elaboration of national financial reports.
- There have been difficulties in complying with a few deadlines.
- I would have liked the coordinator to have put a bit more pressure on the work of partners as we approach the delivery of the pilots.
- There were no problems encountered.
- Some deadlines couldn't be matched. The reasons are multiple.

#### **Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- The communication level with André and Mette is very high and they are always there to support you.
- Efficient role of the coordinator in leading project development and ensuring the accomplishment of deadline's results.
- The experience of the coordinator institution in managing similar projects.
- The style of relationship with partners is very straight forward, direct but polite.
- Very good management, efficient coordination.
- The work is well organized and in friendly way. Documents i.e. meetings minutes prepared on time and of good quality.
- Very friendly and engage coordination.

**The partners describe the co-ordinator as very efficient, well managed and experienced in managing similar projects. The communication with the coordinator is very high and supportive. The only problem that occurred was**

**difficulties in complying with deadlines., although the project was always able to cope with the situation.**

## **1.2 Comments on “Feasibility/practicality of project planning”**

### **Problems encountered:**

- Sometimes the deadlines are provided with tight times.
- The planning needs a constant update, due to delays and non compliance with previous deadlines.
- Project planning is a bit skewed towards product development and the working of the partnership. I **believe more planning (and action) is required to engage with target groups for the pilots and the broader stakeholder groups.**
- We did not face real problems. Once or twice we felt the allocated time was a bit too short, we asked for few more days and the coordinator accepted it. This does not impede at all upon the project’s progress or quality of the products.
- Some aspects of the project are difficult to realise and sometimes it would be better to rethink some activities, like the complete translation of the Case studies, which is not really a huge gain for the community of business adviser, since it is to extended.

### **Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- The planning has been flexible enough and constantly updated.
- There has been progress and the partnership as a whole is working, which is good to see.
- Good consensus among the partners.
- Events and steps are consulted with partners and then accepted by all.
- Good planning and good reaction to changes in the deadlines.

**Many partners suggest that there is more time needed in order to comply with the deadlines. But the planning has been flexible and there was a good consensus among the partners.**

## **1.3 Comments on “Handling of administrative and financial matters”**

### **Problems encountered:**

- Some confusion regarding financial budgets at the beginning of the project.
- Reply to questions raised by the partners should be a little bit faster.

- There were no problems encountered.
- There was a couple of delays due to delayed feedback from SPI.

**Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- Strong answer trying to solve the problems.
- The experience of the coordinator institution in managing these issues.
- Everything transparent and clear.
- Lots of understanding and support from coordinating team.
- Financial rules are clearly presented, templates and assistance is provided in due time.
- Actually every thing running very smoothly. The financial and administrative matters are being handled in a detailed and effective way.

**Some comments mention that some confusion regarding financial budgets emerged and that questions raised by partners should be replied faster. But there are also aspects which went well like good management and support of administrative and financial issues by the coordinating team.**

#### **1.4 Comments on "Problem-solving"**

**Problems encountered:**

- There is a good attitude from all partners to solve problems.
- There has been some continuity issues, for example partners replacing people assigned to the project, making it difficult for newcomers to grasp what the project is about and how best to contribute to it.
- There were no problems encountered.

**Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- BEST FORM consortium has created a useful collaboration that enhances the attitude to solve the problem encountered.
  - Partners have a very open and sincere communication amongst them.
  - Partners are very efficient when in need to handle with a specific problem.
  - Everybody is keen to contribute and get on with their work for the project.
  - Good mobilization of the partners for preparing the Interim Report.
  - Partnership is effective in solving problem and applying changes if necessary.
  - Good communication in the partnership. All problems could be addressed and solved.
- Good problem solving 😊.

**Additional comments:**

- Elaborating and sending the Interim Report in due time and at the required standards had a high stake and created a kind of pressure, but the coordinating team was very well organised and acted professionally in gathering data, documents, etc. from partners and in managing excellently the situation under the given conditions. It proved determination but also gentleness in working with the others.

**There is a positive feedback regarding the aspect problem-solving. The partners are efficient, show supportive communication and share the spirit of finding solutions for problems encountered.**

### **1.5 Comments on "Relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out"**

#### **Problems encountered:**

- Only issue from my perspective is that the definition of business advisor seems to differ accordingly to which country is examined and this can sometimes create difficulties in the synergy of the activities and the objectives.
- In a few occasions, the results and outcomes were behind the expectations set in the proposal.
- As stated, I would like to see more activities aimed at connecting with community leaders, community advisers and other people playing a role in their communities.
- There were no problems encountered.
- In a few occasions, the results and outcomes were behind the expectations set in the proposal.

#### **Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- The objectives and the activities carried out are connected to the real needs.
- I do believe that the overall project aims correspond to the activities that the partnership is carrying out and has carried out.
- Still, the results produced so far generally satisfy the main goals of the project.
- The pilot programme is beginning to take shape; contacts with potential participants have been established.
- Perfect correlation objectives-activities. The partnership could perform all foreseen activities and thus achieved the objectives.
- Still, the results produced so far generally satisfy the main goals of the project.

**Additional comments:**

- Objectives were relevant first of all for the partners (we believe in them!), and of course for the stakeholders as well.

**Generally the comments on the aspect of the relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out were positive. In addition there were comments that the definition of business advisor differed accordingly which could create difficulties in the synergy of the activities and objectives and that there should be more contact with community leaders, community advisor and other people in immigrant community.**

**1.6 Comments on "Accord and shared visions within the WP"****Problems encountered:**

- I think it would take more time to develop a shared vision because the project has many ramifications. This is not a criticism or 'problem' as such but simply a fact.
- There were no problems encountered.

**Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- Partners exchange opinions and give in general feedbacks to the partner which is leading the WP.
- Each WP coordinator and each partner is very aware of their role and tasks within the project.
- The level of consensus is sufficient to ensure the project has a good chance of reaching its short term objectives.
- Shared vision achieved from the beginning.
- At the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting details of preparing training modules were discussed and partners should have a clear vision what is expected from them.
- each WP coordinator and each partner is very aware of their role and tasks within the project.

**Additional comments:**

- Only a shared vision that highlights the strategic potential of the project and therefore gives it higher priority would make it possible to pursue longer term objectives beyond Sep 2012.

- Each WP leader supported in an efficient way the others in developing and achieving the tasks.

**Although it might take more time to create a shared vision amongst partners because people have different perceptions, operate in different realities and the project has many ramifications, there are also optimistic comments that there are interest in the concepts and the model and also the willingness to think laterally, which can be beneficial for the development of the approach.**

### **1.7 Comments on "Satisfaction with the state of development of activities in the WPs"**

#### **Problems encountered:**

- There were some delays in the execution of WP2 but these delays didn't affect the implementation of the next WPs.
- There have been some delays in some of the WPs, but it seems to have improved, but it is important not to delay the work in progress and future activities.
- WP2 activities were too delayed.
- A few activities of WP3 and WP6 were also behind schedule.
- I think the lack of experience of assisting real entrepreneurs is making it difficult for some partners to develop learning materials that can 'talk' both to entrepreneurs and advisers. The treatment is a bit 'text book' like, too dry.
- There were no problems encountered.
- WP2 activities were too delayed.
- A few activities of WP3 and WP6 were also behind schedule.

#### **Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- I think all partners have done great efforts to "catch up" with the delays, and are ensuring that no future delay will occur.
- Partners have a great capacity to make additional efforts in order to comply with deadlines and to timely produce outcomes of the project.
- Partners are willing to have a go and I'm sure there will be a shift of emphasis as we move closer to the pilot programmes.
- The partnership worked efficient and we have no delays or under-achievements of the activities/outcomes.

- I think all partners are motivated and put a lot of efforts to perform their tasks properly.
- Partners have a great capacity to make additional efforts in order to comply with deadlines and to timely produce outcomes of the project.

**Summing up, the partners are content with the state of the development of the activities in the work packages. But they also mention that there have been some delays in some WPs and the partners try their best to comply with deadlines.**

## 2 COMMUNICATION

Dimensions	Period 2: Participants stating a "high to very high level of satisfaction" in percentage (number of answers)	Missing answers	Period 1: Participants stating a "high to very high level of satisfaction" in percentage (number of answers)	Missing answers
The role of the co-ordinator in the communication process	100% (8)	1	100% (7)	1
Communication flows among partners	77,78% (7)	-	87,5% (7)	-
Level of attention on the developed work (e.g. feedback)	66,67% (5)	-	66,67%(5)	-
Partners' active attitude (e.g. initiative in presenting proposals and themes for elaboration/discussion)	87,5% (7)	1	87,5% (7)	-
Technical issues using the project communication tools	85,71% (6)	2	100% (6)	2

*Table2: Communication amongst partners for period two and one.*

The partners are very content with the role of the co-ordinator in the communication process. 77,78% of the partners are satisfied with the communication flow among partners and 87,5% with the active attitude of the partners, which is expressed through the initiative in presenting proposals and themes for elaboration and discussions. More than the half of the partners (66,67%) is content with the level of attention on the developed work, for example feedback.

In summary the communication is in a positive state, but there could be a greater focus on the level of attention on the developed work. Here no changes happened since the first evaluation round. Moreover there is a certain decline regarding the communication flow (drop from 87,5% to 77,5%) and the use of communication tools (drop from 100% to 85%). These issues are not of major concern, since they still well rated, but still the numbers underline a possibility for improvement.

Below there are individual comments on each single question/aspect:

## 2.1 Comments on “The role of the co-ordinator in the communication process”

### Problems encountered:

- Overall, communication is good but at times, when the main coordinator is away, there are gaps.
- There was nothing to criticize.

### Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Both, Andre and Mette are always available if you need something or you have doubts.
- The coordinator has established a positive leadership in the communication process.
- The communication flows efficiently among partners, being smooth, open, sincere and intense.
- Most of time, communication is good, with clear information and suggestions about tasks.
- Active, efficient and “visible” continuously.
- Coordinator responds to every email and organizes skype conference to ensure good communication. If there is a need a reminders are sent to avoid delays.
- Very good coordination. Open and problem solving oriented. Understands his role as coordinator and not as leader, which is obviously very good for collaboration and cooperation within the project.

**In comparison with the first evaluation round the project partners still think that the co-ordinator has established a positive leadership in the communication process. The partners appreciate that he enables a good, active and efficient communication.**

## 2.2 Comments on “Communication flows among partners”

### Problems encountered:

- I would like to have a better communication level among partners.
- I would like to see a bit more substance in the communication.
- There was nothing to criticize.

### Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- I think in general that there is a good communication flow between partners and that partners coordinating a WP is very good to take responsibility for the WP and inform the coordinator about the progress.
- Good communication flows thanks to frequent contacts among partners.
- The communication flows efficiently among partners, being smooth, open, sincere and intense.
- There is communication.
- Permanent/continued proper and pleasant communication style (friendly, balanced and supportive).
- Good communication within the partnership, although some partners are at some time detached.

**Similar to the first survey the coordinated and moderated communication is satisfactory. The communication works well because of frequent contacts among the partners, although some partners wish to have more communication flow.**

## 2.3 Comments on “Level of attention on the developed work (e.g. feedback)”

### Problems encountered:

- In my opinion more in-depth feedback could always be given, but in general partners gave good feedback - but could maybe be improved slightly.
- Partners should be able to provide more inputs in the outcomes developed by other partners.
- More time for feedback should be provided, especially for longer documents.
- I would like to see a bit more substance in the communication.
- There was nothing to criticize.
- More feedback on the work of the different partners would be supportive.

**Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- Partners in general provide good feedback.
- All the partners are positive involved in the work development.
- All partners showed a high level of involvement, they reacted at the requests of the coordinating team or of the WPs' leaders.

**In general there is the same opinion like in the pervious evaluation. All partners are positively involved in the work development and provide good feedback. The feedback could be more detailed and profound in order to benefit more from it.**

#### **2.4 Comments on "Partners' active attitude" (e.g. initiative in presenting proposals and themes for elaboration/discussion)**

**Problems encountered:**

- I would like to have more initiatives from the rest partners.
- I think partners are all keen but probably very busy on other projects, which might be reducing their ability to be more proactive. For people joining the project at a later stage is also more difficult to be proactive.
- There was nothing to criticize.

**Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- UK partner provides useful information for the development of modules.
- I think partners are very proactive in their work and their attitude towards implementing a project with very good quality. All partners also participate well in all discussions and meetings.
- Every partner act in a proactive way.
- All partners are very experienced in LLP projects, having a positive attitude.
- People are very professional and keen to contribute.
- Stimulated by the WPs' leaders, the partners brought their contribution and provided useful ideas and proposals for the "format" of the outcomes.
- Partners are all very engaged, understand the project and give direct feedback on different issues. The discussions during the meetings are intensive and target oriented.

**Some partners believe that the rest partners should do more on their own initiative and other respondents think the project members act in a proactive**

**way. But the majority have a very positive impression about the attitude and professionalism of the partners.**

## **2.5 Comments on “Technical issues using the project communication tools”**

### **Problems encountered:**

- We don't use project intranet.
- The platform the partnership as a whole is not using very much I think.
- There was nothing to criticize.

### **Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- I think the mailing list works very well and is a good tool to reach everyone in the partnership.
- The organization of mid-term virtual meetings is a positive point of the project communication.
- Fast and efficient communication due to the use of combination of specific tools (emails, Skype, web).
- Communication tools are efficient (emails, skype).

### **Additional comments:**

- The project communication tools (website, ..) have to be translated in the national languages.
- I cannot really comment on this aspect, as I have not made full use of the different tools.

**The communication tools are described as very efficient and fast (e-Mails and skype) and the mailing list is seen as a good tool to reach everyone in the partnership.**

### 3 ADDED VALUE (OF INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES)

Dimension	Period 2: Participants stating a "high to very high level of satisfaction" in percentage (number of answers)	Missing answers	Period 1: Participants stating a "high to very high level of satisfaction" in percentage (number of answers)	Missing answers
Expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries	88,89% (8)	-	87,5% (7)	-
Added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which you know of / you participate in	87,50% (7)	1	75% (6)	-
Expected learning outcomes from participation in the project activities	100% (9)	-	87,5% (7)	-

*Table 3: Rating added-value for period two and one.*

8 of 9 partners see the great expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries. 87,50 % of the partners see an added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which are known due to own participation for example. All of them see the expected learning outcomes from participation in the project activities. There is an improvement of the rating in comparison to round 1 of the project. The partners are expressing to recognise a higher added-value due to the participation in the project, they expect high levels of learning and see a strong added-value when comparing BEST FORM with similar initiatives.

In the follow there are individual comments on each single question/aspect.

#### 3.1 Comments on "Expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries"

##### Problems encountered:

- At this point there is as such no critical aspect other than hoping that the final results really will be as good as they suggest being at this stage.
- The forthcoming activities (content development and pilot course implementation) are critical success factors for the expected added value come true.
- The level and type of added value will very much depend on delivery on the ground, using experienced, confident tutors capable of getting the most out of participants. At the moment I don't know whether this will be the case.
- There is nothing to criticize.
- In fact in our country there is lack of direct beneficiaries (business advisory services) so we need to address the outcomes to other institutions working with migrants.
- The project grounds on a very good project for supporting business advisers and their clients. It is difficult to design a training suitable for all countries. It is necessary to localise it strongly to the respective countries.

**Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- The results achieved until now are directly addressed to the project beneficiaries and therefore there are useful for them.
- I believe that if the final result of the content and the interactive tool is as positive and high quality as it seems at this intermediate stage, the beneficiaries will gain an added value from the target group being better equipped to deal with the beneficiaries.
- The project outcomes will create new job prospect for the beneficiaries.
- If successfully implemented, Best Form may help to boost immigrant entrepreneurship and help immigrant-oriented associations to develop innovative services related to business support.
- Participants will get much more than new knowledge and skills; they will establish new contacts, meet peers in other organisations and will have an opportunity to digest themes of critical importance for them and people in their communities.
- As we could find out during the needs analysis, during the elaboration of the case studies and of the network database, when we got in touch with stakeholders and managers, the BEST FORM project outcomes are needed and they represent a novelty in the same time for the local context here.
- There is a niche in our country, no similar products are available. Exchange of best practice from other countries.
- Important topic. Especially the community-based approach is innovative and can even

be applied in other fields.

**The partners are very optimistic and hopeful regarding the replication of the model in different country situations. There is the hope to improve the situation for migrant entrepreneurship in the country of each project partner. One partner for example writes that there is a niche in his/her country and that there are no similar products available. Another partner is concerned that it might be difficult to design a training suitable for all countries.**

### **3.2 Comments on “Added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which you know of / you participate in”**

#### **Problems encountered:**

- Best form to some extent does have similarities of other projects that I know but these are not directed to immigrants, which I believe is the main difference.
- Italian context offers similar survey and research.

#### **Positive/satisfactory aspects:**

- There aren't similar initiatives in project countries so the project has a high added value.
- I think the project brings added value to the immigrant community.
- The innovative aspect of the approach proposed.
- Compared to other collaborative projects, I think participants will get much more.
- Due to our role in the project (mainly evaluation), the added value related to the development of new instruments, concepts and tools for evaluation.

**There are opinions that there is a high added value of the project compared to similar initiatives because of the consideration of individual needs of immigrants and because the main issues of the project are very new and innovative.**

**Whereas, in some countries there are similar researches on this topic (for example in Italy) which should have kept in mind as well. But similar projects are not directed to immigrants. Another partner emphasizes that the added value relates to the development of new instruments, concepts and tools for evaluation.**

### **3.3 Comments on “Expected learning outcomes from participation in the project**

## activities”

### Problems encountered:

- The pilot course will be too short to adequately develop all skills.
- The transfer of innovation does not include other components of the CBBS (such as institutional strengthening).
- There was nothing to criticize.

### positive/satisfactory aspects:

- The expected learning outcomes are high as it is a new field for us.
- I think the learning outcomes will be directed towards learning more about immigrant communities and how skills can be improved from a practical point of view.
- The project focuses on the key aspects to develop skills among the trainees.
- I’m confident the project is already a good learning experience for all of us, partners. I’m also confident it will be the same for participants in the pilot programmes.
- Approaching the immigrants in general:
  - knowing how to deal with their needs, worries and fears;
  - understanding other cultures
  - increasing tolerance.
- Accurate transfer and adaptation of CBBA model to Romanian realities.
- Have a good recognition in the area of supporting migrants. (contacts, cooperation with public authorities, foundations, and other institutions).
- Development of new approaches to evaluation of an European project.
- Learning how to implement a community-based “empowerment” approach.

**One partner criticized that the pilot course will be too short adequately develop all skills. But it was also mentioned that it also enables us to learn more about immigrant communities and approach them in general (how to deal with their needs, worries and fears; understanding other cultures; increasing tolerance) and how skills can be improved from a practical point of view. It has a good recognition in the area of supporting migrants.**

## 4 STRENGTHS OF BEST FORM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

### Strengths:

- Very Strong communication between partners.
- Strong team work between partners.

- The collaboration process is good although there are not a lot of feedback or contributions of the work done until now from all partners.
- There is a real support from the coordinator in all fields: technical and financial.
- The project progress is in general good.
- There is a clear transmission of the know-how of the UK to the rest partners.
- I believe that we have a very strong partnership and all partners bring an added value to the project. I feel all partners contribute to the project development and have a genuine interest in the project and for the project to succeed.
- The project team has created a great collaboration between partner thanks to the strong commitment of every project manager.
- The collaboration between high professionals from different job fields and competencies (academic institutions, consultancies and Ngo's) is the added value of the project.
- The quality of the partnership – the institutions are quite experienced in LLP projects and thus are aware of their roles and tasks within Best Form.
- The diversity of involved institutions – gathering private companies, universities and NGOs, Best Form partnership allows for a market-oriented approach, supported by an academic background, but with deep and direct links to the target groups and beneficiaries on the ground.
- The quality of the work plan – the proposal sets a clear path in terms of activities, results and outcomes to be produced during the project lifetime, helping the partners to understand their role.
- Professional, experienced partners committed to making the project work.
- Interest in the main theme of the project, creating possibilities for further development.
- An experienced project manager coordinating the partnership.
- Access to a well developed programme and materials from the UK.
- A partner with many years' experience providing business support to the target groups.
- As for evaluation round one, one may notice that we succeeded to maintain the positive features, so the strong points would be, again: the homogeneity of the partnership, lack of divergent points of view in the ways and solutions used in approaching the implementation, impressive variety of expertise and experience among partners.
- We may also add: friendly cooperative atmosphere, sense of humour (despite the

complexity of the work, the partnership is not “stressed”), seriousness in approaching tasks, professionalism.

- Coordinating institution is very experienced in managing LLP projects.
- Good organization of works.
- Good motivation of partners.
- Products for transfer are really innovative for target countries.
- Partnership
- Coordination
- Well defined workplan
- Collaboration and cooperation across the project

**There are many very positive comments on the strengths of the project BEST FORM. Many project partners describe a well functioning partnership with well structured and planned activities (good project management and organisation), a good work attitude (high motivation) and a collaborative environment. The experience of each partner working in an international context ensures an efficient collaboration.**

#### **Weaknesses:**

- Different situations among migrant situation in several countries.
- There were some delays in the implementation of WP2.
- The project website is not ready within the first project year and this is the main dissemination common tool for the project.
- If we don't use the project intranet, I don't see its utility.
- The differences in goals and expectations among partner countries, due to the implementation of pilot courses only in Italy and Portugal.
- Relative lack of enterprise support experience in the partnership.
- Relative lack of practitioners' perspective, that is front line workers rather than managers and project managers.
- Situation in partner countries is very different in case of immigration. In some countries supporting immigrants in entrepreneurship is at very low level or not organized at all. It is not easy to find channels for exploitation of the results. There is a need to first rise awareness of this matter, “prepare the soil” before implementing the product.
- The implementation is not taking place in all countries (but this was clear at proposal

stage).

- Harmonisation of the training approach across the different countries might be difficult. The distributed development of the training materials can lead to significant differences in the materials in terms of didactic and quality.

**It is mentioned that the situation of immigrants is different in several countries. In some countries supporting immigrants in entrepreneurship is at very low level or not organized at all. It is important to rise awareness of this matter first. One project partner stresses that project website was not ready within the first project year although it is a very important tool to disseminate the project. Another partner writes that there were differences in goals and expectations among partner countries. Two partners think that there is a relative lack of enterprise support and practitioners' perspective. Additionally, the implementation is not taking place in all countries and the harmonisation of the training approach across the different countries might be difficult.**

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

In general the overall satisfaction with the project BEST FORM is very high.

This is underlined by for instances the very high number of positive comments on the strengths of the project BEST FORM. The project partners describe the project as a very well-functioning partnership with well-structured and planned activities. Project management and organisation are rated very high as well as the motivation of all partners involved. The experience of each partner working in an international context is seen as a key issue for an efficient collaboration. Especially very interesting is the high level of judgement regarding the potential added-value of the project.

There are some minor issues – e.g. satisfaction with the state of development – that still have potential for improvement, the partnership is informed and works towards progress in this matter.